

ABSTRACT TROPICAL LINEAR PROGRAMMING

GEORG LOHO

ABSTRACT. Analogously to classical oriented matroid programming, we give the first feasibility algorithm for signed tropical oriented matroids, which encode the structure of tropical linear inequality systems. The feasibility problem for tropical linear inequality systems is of special interest as it is in $\text{NP} \cap \text{co-NP}$ but no polynomial time algorithm is known.

To encode the combinatorial structure of tropical linear inequality systems, we equip tropical oriented matroids, which were introduced to study the combinatorics of tropical point configurations, with an additional sign information. We generalize the feasibility problem for tropical linear inequality systems to signed tropical oriented matroids. This allows us to formulate pivoting between basic covectors which only depends on the combinatorial structure and not on the coefficients of the inequalities. We combined ideas from tropical geometry, polyhedral combinatorics and combinatorial optimization to deduce a pure graph algorithm from the classical simplex method via its tropicalization. The complexity of the algorithm only depends on the dimension of the input and not on the size of the coefficients.

We give an explicit translation between the tropical feasibility problem and the feasibility problem for scheduling with AND-OR-constraints with arbitrary coefficients. Furthermore, we introduce a three-step scheme to transform the general feasibility problem to a better tractable case. We finish by giving a brief explanation of the connection of our result with mean payoff games.

1. INTRODUCTION

The goal of our paper is to present a simplex-like algorithm which is a combinatorial abstraction of tropical linear programming. We give methods to modify the structure in such a way that the algorithm has a particularly simple form and lead it back to the general case. These transformations can also be seen as general tools on its own right for the study of tropical linear inequality systems.

The study of tropical linear programs goes back several decades [10, 30, 7], where several variants of this problems were considered, see Butkovič [8] for an introduction. Only recently in [3] and [2], Allamigeon, Benchimol, Gaubert and Joswig translated the classical simplex algorithm by Dantzig [11] to the tropical setting and showed that combinatorial pivoting rules have the same complexity in the classical setting as in the tropical analogue.

Inspired by this approach and the connections to discrete geometry from Develin and Sturmfels [13], we give a feasibility algorithm for tropical linear inequality systems which only relies on the combinatorial structure of the *signed tropical oriented*

INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, TU BERLIN, STR. DES 17. JUNI 136, 10623 BERLIN, GERMANY
E-mail address: loho@math.tu-berlin.de.

Key words and phrases. tropical linear inequality systems, oriented matroid programming, linear programming, and/or precedence constraints, mean payoff games, bipartite graphs, polyhedral subdivisions.

matroid. These arise by equipping tropical oriented matroids with an additional sign information. Tropical oriented matroids were originated in the work by Ardila and Develin [5] to encode the combinatorics of tropical point configurations. It was further developed by Oh and Yoo [25] and Silke Horn in [20] where a realizability result by *tropical pseudohyperplanes* is shown. However, our concept only relies on the polyhedral notions elaborated in the core literature [12] by De Loera, Rambau and Santos, which also give an encoding of the combinatorics of tropical point configurations. We obtain an abstraction of the combinatorial structure of the tropicalized simplex method analogously to classical oriented matroid programming which was introduced by Bland [6] and Fukuda [16] and further extended by Todd [29] and Terlaky [28].

The collection of covectors in our description is a finite set of bipartite graphs with signs on the edges. In order to obtain a clear structure of the algorithm we transform a given signed tropical oriented matroid at first and prove in the end that the obtained results are also valid for the original system. We ensure that negative signs are only sparsely distributed which corresponds to the splitting of nodes in [24, §7.4]. Further on, we deal with the case of ∞ entries (and its abstract generalization) and perturbate the configuration such that all the bipartite graphs are forests; this idea already occurs in [2].

In contrast to classical linear programming, there is no polynomial time algorithm known for tropical linear programming. However, it was shown that the feasibility problem is equivalent to finding the winning states of mean payoff games [1] and this problem is known to be in $\text{NP} \cap \text{co-NP}$, cf. [31].

Even if there is no pivoting rule known, for which the classical simplex method solves classical linear programming in polynomial time, there are several algorithms [9, 23, 19] which solve classical linear programs or rather feasibility problems in weakly polynomial time. But as they rely on numerical operations of the coefficients from the input they do not provide *strongly polynomial* algorithms.

The running time of our algorithm only depends on the size $d \times n$ of the input matrix and does not rely on the coefficients, but we could not determine if the running time can be bounded by a polynomial in d and n . However, it provides a better understanding of the combinatorial structure of tropical linear programming which might help to solve the formerly described open complexity questions.

We will start with a translation of scheduling problems with AND/OR precedence constraints which were extensively studied in [24] by Möhring, Skutella and Stork. That illustrates the application of tropical linear programming to problems from combinatorial optimization. Finally, we will introduce generalized tropical covector graphs to formulate more general feasibility results. This leads to duality in terms of covector graphs which is closely related to mean payoff games.

To summarize, we start in Section 2 with an introduction of the main concepts to describe the combinatorics of tropical linear inequality systems. We motivate their study by the reformulation of AND-OR-networks to tropical inequality systems in Section 3, which is not necessary for the understanding of the rest. Section 4 deals with the abstraction to signed tropical oriented matroids and the transformations from the general case to the preconditions 14. The algorithm is described in Section 5; taking the preconditions for granted, it can be understood rather independently of the former sections. Then Section 6 justifies that the algorithm can decide the feasibility of a general tropical linear inequality system. This motivates

the concise presentation of generalized tropical covector graphs and the resulting duality in Section 7. We use the generalized covector graphs in Section 8 to express the connection with mean payoff games.

2. BASIC DEFINITIONS FOR TROPICAL LINEAR INEQUALITY SYSTEMS

The *tropical numbers* consist of the set $\mathbb{T}_{\min} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$. Equipped with the two operations $\oplus$ and $\odot$, where $x \oplus y := \min(x, y)$ and $x \odot y := x + y$ for $x, y \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}$, they form the *tropical semiring*. Just as well, we could consider $\oplus = \max$ as tropical addition. The operations extend to vectors and matrices component-wise and we can define a matrix product analogously to the classical case.

We define a (tropical) *signed system* as a pair (A, Σ) with $(a_{ji}) = A \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^{n \times d}$ and $(\sigma_{ji}) = \Sigma \in \{+, -, \bullet\}^{n \times d}$, where $a_{ji} \neq \infty \Leftrightarrow \sigma_{ji} \neq \bullet$ and each row of Σ contains at least one positive and at least one negative entry. It defines a homogeneous tropical linear inequality system by

$$\bigoplus_{\sigma_{ji}=+, i \in [d]} a_{ji} \odot x_i \leq \bigoplus_{\sigma_{ji}=-, i \in [d]} a_{ji} \odot x_i \quad \text{for } j \in [n],$$

where we use the notation $[d] = \{1, \dots, d\}$.

The *support* $\text{supp}(x)$ of a point $x \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^d$ is the subset of $[d]$ that fulfills $x_i = \infty \Leftrightarrow i \in \text{supp}(x)$.

Definition 1. The (tropical) *covector graph* $G_A(x)$ of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the bipartite graph on the node set $[d] \sqcup [n]$ containing an edge $(i, j) \in [d] \times [n]$ if and only if $a_{ji} + x_i = \min \{a_{jk} + x_k \mid k \in [d], a_{jk} \neq \infty\}$. This means that the covector graph encodes those entries in each row of the product $A \odot x$ where the minimum is attained.

The nodes in $[d]$ are *coordinate nodes* and in $[n]$ are the *apex nodes*. Depending on the sign from Σ , we call the edges in a covector graph *negative* or *positive*. Directly from the definition we obtain a characterization of finite feasible points.

Proposition 2. A point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is feasible for the signed system (A, Σ) if and only if no apex node is only incident with negative edges in $G_A(x)$.

The cells $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid G_A(x) \text{ const}\}$ define a *covector decomposition* of $\mathbb{R}^d$. It is a polyhedral subdivision of $\mathbb{R}^d$ which agrees with the covector decomposition in [22] with respect to the point configuration given by the rows of $-A$.

Notice that the covector graphs are homogeneous in the sense that adding an element of $\mathbb{R} \cdot \mathbf{1} = \mathbb{R} \cdot (1, \dots, 1)$ to a cell yields the same covector graph and the cells in the covector decomposition all contain $\mathbb{R} \cdot \mathbf{1}$ as lineality.

Summarizing [22, Proposition 30 & Proposition 38] yields the following characterization which is similar to [21, Theorem 6.1]. For this, we fix a matrix $A \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^{n \times d}$, for which every row contains a finite entry, and denote by Γ the complete bipartite graph $K_{d,n}$ on the node set $[d] \sqcup [n]$ with the entries of A as weights on its edges.

Proposition 3. A bipartite graph G on $[d] \sqcup [n]$ is a covector graph of a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ w.r.t. A if and only if the following three conditions hold:

- (1) No apex node $j \in [n]$ is isolated in G .
- (2) Let μ be a perfect matching in G on a subset $D \sqcup N$ of the nodes with $D \subseteq [d]$, $N \subseteq [n]$ and $|D| = |N|$. Then μ is a minimal matching in Γ .
- (3) Let μ and η be minimal matchings in Γ . If μ is contained in G , so is η .

Equipped with this terminology, we want to study the feasibility problem for signed systems which means to find a feasible point. We will do this in the terminology of covector graphs.

However, we start in Section 3 by establishing a translation of a class of scheduling problems to the feasibility problem for signed systems.




FIGURE 1. We set $x_1 = 0$ to cancel out the lineality $\mathbb{R} \cdot \mathbf{1}$. The shaded area is the *feasible* region of a signed system formed by the four inequalities. The crooked lines are the boundaries of the *tropical halfspaces*. The bipartite graph is the covector graph of P , where the negative edge is dashed.

3. AND-OR-NETWORKS

In this section, we give a short introduction to a special class of scheduling problems and show in Theorem 5 that the feasible schedules can be described by the feasible points of certain signed systems as defined in Section 2.

If one wants to schedule a project, the jobs may depend on each other and be in some precedence relation. Here, we assume that a started job is not interrupted. If a job can only start if all its predecessor jobs are finished, we call this an *AND-constraint*. If a job can start if at least one of its predecessors is finished, we call this an *OR-constraint*.

In Figure 2, you see the Gantt chart of an AND-constraint and of an OR-constraint visualizing the dependence of the start and finish dates of jobs in these predecessor relations. Here the dashed line denotes the starting time of the next job which is represented by the bottom bar whereas its predecessors are the top three. The lengths of the bars illustrate the processing times.

Notice that usually one requires the special *starting* condition that every job has to begin after some given point in time. In our model, this is covered by the fact




FIGURE 2. Two types of constraints, OR top, AND bottom

that the expressions are additively homogeneous and hence, one can just mark one node and dehomogenize w.r.t. to this coordinate.

For a broader introduction of scheduling with AND-OR-constraints see [24]. We just give a formal definition to work with.

Definition 4. An *AND-OR-network* is given by a set of states V and of waiting conditions U . The waiting conditions are pairs (X, J) with $J \subseteq V$ and $X \subseteq V \setminus \{J\}$.

The pair (V, U) describes a bipartite graph $\mathcal{B}$ with node set $V \sqcup U$. Each waiting condition (X, J) is expressed by the arcs $(x, (X, J))$ for $x \in X$ and $((X, J), j)$ for $j \in J$. Because of $X \subseteq V \setminus \{J\}$, for each pair $v \in V$ and $u \in U$ there exists at most one of the arcs (u, v) or (v, u) . We denote the arc set by $\mathcal{A}$.

Furthermore, we have a weight function $\omega: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ on the arcs to encode processing times, or time lags if the weight is negative.

Then we can describe the precedence constraints for the vector of starting times $t \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^{V \sqcup U}$ by the inequalities

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} t_v &\geq \max_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{A}} (t_u + \omega(u, v)) && \text{for all } v \in V && (\text{AND}) \\ t_u &\geq \min_{(v,u) \in \mathcal{A}} (t_v + \omega(v, u)) && \text{for all } u \in U && (\text{OR}) . \end{aligned}$$

The max-inequalities correspond to AND-constraints and min-inequalities to OR-constraints.

We can reformulate the first inequality in (1) by splitting the maximization into several inequalities to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (2a) \quad t_v &\geq (t_u + \omega(u, v)) && \text{for all } (u, v) \in \mathcal{A} \text{ with } u \in U, v \in V \\ (2b) \quad t_u &\geq \min_{(v,u) \in \mathcal{A}} (t_v + \omega(v, u)) && \text{for all } u \in U . \end{aligned}$$

Observe that this already yields a signed system.

We can transform the first kind of inequalities (2a) further to

$$\begin{aligned} (2a') \quad t_v - \omega(u, v) &\geq t_u && \text{for all } (u, v) \in \mathcal{A} \text{ with } u \in U, v \in V \Leftrightarrow \\ (2a'') \quad \min_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{A}} (t_v - \omega(u, v)) &\geq t_u && \text{for all } u \in U . \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two kinds of inequalities (2b) and (2a'') yields

$$\min_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{A}} (s_v - \omega(u, v)) \geq s_u \geq \min_{(v,u) \in \mathcal{A}} (s_v + \omega(v, u)) \quad \forall u \in U .$$

Let $|V| = d$ and $|U| = n$. Then we define matrices $(a_{ji}) = A \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^{n \times d}$ and $(\sigma_{ji}) = \Sigma \in \{+, -, \bullet\}^{n \times d}$ by identifying each node in V resp. U with indices in $[d]$ resp. $[n]$ and setting

$$(a(u, v), \sigma(u, v)) = \begin{cases} (\omega(v, u), +) & (v, u) \in \mathcal{A} \\ (-\omega(u, v), -) & (u, v) \in \mathcal{A} \\ (\infty, \bullet) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

for $u \in U$ and $v \in V$. This defines a signed system (A, Σ) whose associated inequality system is

$$(3) \quad \min_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{A}} (s_v + a(u, v)) \geq \min_{(v, u) \in \mathcal{A}} (s_v + a(u, v)) \quad \text{for all } u \in U.$$

In the other direction, if we are given a feasible solution $(s_v)_{v \in V}$ of (3) we can define starting times s_u for $u \in U$ by $s_u = \min_{(v, u) \in \mathcal{A}} (s_v + a(u, v))$ such that $(s_k)_{k \in U \sqcup V}$ fulfills (1). We summarize our considerations in the following theorem.

Theorem 5. *The set of feasible points for (3) is the projection of the set of feasible starting times for (1) on the coordinates labeled by V . Furthermore, for every feasible point of (3) we find a feasible point of (1).*

4. SIGNED TROPICAL ORIENTED MATROIDS

4.1. A Description via Polytopes and Graphs. A *polytope* is the convex hull of finitely many points and a *polyhedron* is the intersection of finitely many halfspaces. The *subpolytope* of a polytope P is the convex hull of a subset of the vertices of P . The convex hull of $k + 1$ affinely independent points, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, is a k -simplex and is denoted by Δ_k . Mainly, we think of Δ_k as the convex hull of the $k + 1$ *standard basis vectors* $e_1, \dots, e_{k+1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$. The *product* of two polytopes $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $Q \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is the convex hull of the pairs $(p, q) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+n}$ where p resp. q ranges over all the vertices of P resp. Q . Finally, a *polyhedral complex* is a finite set of polyhedra for which each face of a polyhedron is also contained in the set and the intersection of two polytopes is either empty or a face of both. A polyhedral complex is a *(polyhedral) subdivision* of a polyhedron P if the union of all the occurring polyhedra is P . A subdivision of a polytope $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is *regular* if it is the orthogonal projection, omitting the last coordinate, of the bounded cells of the polyhedron $\text{conv}\{(x, h(x)) \mid x \text{ vertex of } P\} + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cdot e_{d+1}$ for some height function $h: \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

We already saw in Prop. 2 that the feasibility of a point can be characterized by its covector graph with the signs on its edges. In this section we consider a generalization of the collection of these covectors. The study of these *tropical oriented matroids* was started in [5] and further developed in [25] and [20]. We use a slightly different approach which also encloses the case when the coefficients can be finite. It was shown in [20] that the two notions agree as generalizations of the finite coefficient case.

If the entries of A are all finite then [13, Theorem 1] states that the collection of covectors is in bijection with a regular polyhedral subdivision of $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$. This was generalized in [15] and [22] to matrices with ∞ entries. For those, the collection of covectors defines a regular subdivision of a subpolytope of $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$. For an introduction to these polyhedral notions see [12].

This motivates us to consider the more general situation of a (not-necessarily regular) polyhedral subdivision $\mathcal{S}$ of a subpolytope $\mathcal{F}$ of $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$. Non-regular triangulations of $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$ exist for e.g. $\max(d, n) \geq 6$ and already for $(d, n) = (4, 4)$, see [12, §6.2.2].

Note that subpolytopes of $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$ and therefore the cells in $\mathcal{S}$ are in bijection with subgraphs of $K_{d,n}$ via the identification of the vertex (e_i, e_j) with the edge $(i, j) \in [d] \times [n]$. Since all these graphs share the same node set $[d] \sqcup [n]$, we will often even identify them with their set of edges.

Let Σ be a sign matrix, $(\sigma_{ji}) = \Sigma \in \{+, -, \bullet\}^{n \times d}$ for which $\sigma_{ji} \neq \bullet$ if and only if $(j, i) \notin \mathcal{F}$. Furthermore, we require that there is at least one positive and one negative entry per row. Then we define a *signed tropical oriented matroid* (STOM) $(\mathcal{S}, \Sigma)$ as the set of bipartite graphs without isolated nodes in $[n]$, which correspond to cells in $\mathcal{S}$, with the signs of Σ assigned to the edges. The bipartite graphs are the *covector graphs* or just *covectors*. A STOM is *realizable* if it is induced by a matrix, which means that the covectors are covector graphs in the sense of Definition 1 or equivalently, $\mathcal{S}$ is regular as a polyhedral subdivision.

Again, we consider the entries of Σ as signs on the edges; we call an edge with $+$ a *positive edge* and with $-$ a *negative edge*. We call the bipartite graphs corresponding to the cells in $(\mathcal{S}, \Sigma)$ also *covector graphs*, the nodes in $[n]$ *apex nodes* and the nodes in $[d]$ *coordinate nodes*.

In Section 5, we define an abstract version of tropical linear programming, given as an algorithm for finding a feasible cell. To execute the algorithm, the STOM has to fulfill some prerequisites. We describe how one can modify a given STOM $(\mathcal{S}, \Sigma)$ so that we can apply the algorithm but can withdraw the correct result for $(\mathcal{S}, \Sigma)$.

4.2. Splitting Apex Nodes. To fulfill Precondition 14, we have to ensure that every row of Σ has one $-$ entry which means by our assumption on Σ that it has exactly one $-$ entry. In the realizable case, the following lemma yields a method to split an inequality such that the minimum on the bigger side of the new inequalities contains only one term. This **splitting of apex nodes** was already similarly used in [24, §7.4].

Lemma 6. *Let $I \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ be a finite index set, $b_0, b_i \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}$ for $i \in I$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ an arbitrary positive number.*

Then $b_0 \leq \bigoplus_{i \in I} b_i$ if and only if $b_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in I \setminus \{\ell\}} (b_i + \varepsilon) \leq b_\ell$ for all $\ell \in I$.

Proof. “ $\Rightarrow$ ” If $b_0 \leq b_i$ for each $i \in I$. Then $b_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in I \setminus \{\ell\}} (b_i + \varepsilon) = b_0 \leq b_\ell$ for all $\ell \in I$.

“ $\Leftarrow$ ” If the first inequality is not fulfilled, there is an $h \in I$ with $b_h = \bigoplus_{i \in I} b_i < b_0$. The case $b_i = \infty$ for each $i \in I$ leads directly to the contradiction $\infty < b_0$. Otherwise, we obtain $b_h < \bigoplus_{i \in I \setminus \{h\}} (b_i + \varepsilon)$ which implies $b_h < b_0 \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in I \setminus \{h\}} (b_i + \varepsilon)$. That contradicts the inequality for h . $\square$

We explain what this splitting of an inequality means for the covector of an $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$: Assume that we split the inequality of the n th row of $A \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^{n \times d}$ where the entries $i_1, \dots, i_k$ of Σ are $-$. This yields a coefficient matrix $\hat{A} \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^{(n+k-1) \times d}$ where $k-1$ copies of the n th row of A are attached and ε is added to the entries $\{i_1, \dots, i_k\} \setminus \{i_\ell\}$ in the row $n-1+\ell$ for $\ell \in [k]$. Then, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the set of coordinate nodes adjacent to n in the covector graph $G_A(x)$ is exactly the union of the sets of




FIGURE 3. An apex node which has three negative incident edges in the complete bipartite graph is replaced by three apex nodes.

coordinate nodes which are adjacent to the copies of n in $G_{\hat{A}}(x)$. A visualization of the idea is given in Figure 3.

Now, we use polyhedral arguments to construct a bigger STOM which mimics this splitting of the inequalities in its covector graphs. Assume w.l.o.g. that $k > 1$ entries of the n th row of Σ are $-$.

We only present how the technique works if $k = 2$; this can be iterated. Construct a subdivision $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ of a subpolytope $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$ of $\Delta_{n-1+1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$ from $(\mathcal{S}, \Sigma)$. Consider $\mathcal{F} \subseteq [d] \times [n]$ embedded as the convex hull of

$$\left(\left\{ (e_j, e_i) \mid (i, j) \in \mathcal{F}, j \neq n \right\} \cup \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2}e_n, e_i \right) \mid (i, n) \in \mathcal{F} \right\} \right) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$$

and $\hat{\mathcal{F}} = \{(i, j) \in \mathcal{F}\} \cup \{(i, n+1) \mid (i, n) \in \mathcal{F}\} \subseteq [d] \times [n+1]$ embedded as the convex hull of

$$\left\{ (e_j, e_i) \mid (i, j) \in \hat{\mathcal{F}} \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Define the projection $\pi: \mathbb{R}^{n+1} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with

$$(y_1, \dots, y_n, y_{n+1}, z_1, \dots, z_d) \mapsto (y_1, \dots, \frac{y_n + y_{n+1}}{2}, z_1, \dots, z_d)$$

By linearity, the preimage $\pi^{-1}(\mathcal{S})$ is a polyhedral subdivision of

$\hat{\mathcal{F}} + \mathbb{R} \cdot (e_n - e_{n+1}, \mathbf{0})$. Now, define $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ as the union of the $\pi^{-1}(C) \cap \hat{\mathcal{F}}$ for each cell C in $\mathcal{S}$.

Lemma 7. *If $G \subseteq K_{d,n}$ is the graph corresponding to the cell C then $G \cup \{(i, n+1) \mid (i, n) \in G\}$ is the graph (represented by its edges) corresponding to $\pi^{-1}(C) \cap \hat{\mathcal{F}}$. In particular, $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ is a polyhedral subdivision of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$.*

Proof. The preimage of the vertex $(\frac{1}{2}e_n, e_i)$ of $\mathcal{F}$ is the convex hull of the vertices (e_n, e_i) and (e_{n+1}, e_i) of $\hat{\mathcal{F}}$. The rest follows by the linearity of the projection. $\square$

Now, consider the case that the n th row of Σ has $k \geq 2$ indices $i_1, \dots, i_k$ where the entry is $-$. Applying the case for $k = 2$ iteratively $k - 1$ times, we obtain a STOM where every covector graph has k copies of the old apex node n including the incident edges. Fix an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ and let $(m_{ji}) = M \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+k-1) \times d}$ be the zero matrix where we replace m_{ji} by ε if $j > n - 1$ except for $i_{j-(n-1)}$, corresponding to the $-$ entries of Σ . In the realizable case, the first operation would copy the n th row of A and we would just add M to A . In the non-realizable case, we apply [12, Lemma 2.3.16 & Corollary 2.3.18] and obtain a refinement of $\mathcal{S}$ w.r.t. M ; this concept is explained further in the subsection 4.4 “Refinement”. Finally, we replace

the n th row of Σ with k copies of this row, where we replace all the $-$ entries in every row j for $j > n - 1$ by $+$ except for $(j, i_{j-(n-1)})$, where we keep the $-$.

By this process, we can construct a signed tropical oriented (m, d) -matroid $(\hat{\mathcal{S}}, \hat{\Sigma})$ such that $m \leq n \cdot d$ and every row of $\hat{\Sigma}$ contains exactly one negative entry.

4.3. Extension from a Subpolytope to $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$. For inductive steps, we want to restrict the graphs to node sets which are proper subsets of $[d] \sqcup [n]$. This corresponds to the consideration of faces of the polytope $\mathcal{F}$. Since the face structure of subpolytopes of $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$ can be a bit more subtle, we only want to deal with the case of the polytope $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$ and therefore extend the subdivision. We call this **extension**.

[12, Lemma 4.3.2] provides a tool to construct an extension of a subdivision by placing vertices. Especially, we can extend a subdivision $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{F}$ to a subdivision $\mathcal{T}$ of the polytope $\Delta_{d-1} \times \Delta_{n-1}$ which means that $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ agree on $\mathcal{F}$.

If $\mathcal{S}$ is a regular triangulation given by a weight matrix $A \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^{n \times d}$ then [12, Lemma 4.3.4] indicates that we should replace the ∞ entries by increasing sufficiently large numbers, so that the resulting matrix induces a regular triangulation of $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$.

Namely, if there are $k < n \cdot d$ entries with ∞ we can introduce a sequence of artificial infinities $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_k$. We require, that, for every $i \in [k]$, Ω_i is bigger than the sum of the absolute values of the finite entries of A with every Ω_ℓ for $\ell < i$. We will calculate with these Ω_i just formally and denote the resulting matrix by $A(\Omega)$.

To show that the matrix $A(\Omega)$ from Lemma 8 induces an extension of the subdivision of $\mathcal{F}$ by A , we replace iteratively the ∞ entries by the Ω . Let A_1 be obtained from A by replacing one ∞ entry, which belongs to the edge e , with a positive number Ω_1 which is bigger than the sum of the absolute values of the finite entries of A . Consider an arbitrary maximal covector graph G w.r.t. A and let μ be a matching on $D \sqcup N \subseteq [d] \sqcup [n]$ in G . By Proposition 3, the matching μ is minimal w.r.t. to the coefficients of A . Hence, by definition of Ω_1 , the edge e cannot be contained in a matching on $D \sqcup N$. Since this is true for any matching in G , again by Proposition 3, the graph G is also a covector w.r.t. A_1 . This implies that the subdivision induced by $A(\Omega)$ extends the subdivision induced by A , since a polyhedral complex is given by its maximal cells. Hence, if A induces a regular subdivision $\mathcal{S}$ of $\mathcal{F}$ then $A(\Omega)$ induces a regular subdivision of $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$ which extends $\mathcal{S}$. For the extended subdivision we also want to resolve the $\bullet$ entries of the sign matrix. For this, we just replace them by $+$.

We summarize these considerations in the following Lemma.

Lemma 8. *The STOM for $A \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^{n \times d}$ and a sign matrix Σ is contained in the STOM for $A(\Omega) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ where we replace $\bullet$ by $+$ in Σ .*

The result of the extension motivates the following definition.

Definition 9. A STOM $(\mathcal{S}, \Sigma)$ is *full* if $\mathcal{S}$ is a subdivision of the polytope $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$. Then in particular, Σ contains only $-$ and $+$.

4.4. Refinement. The graphs in a STOM $(\mathcal{S}, \Sigma)$ have a particularly simple form if $\mathcal{S}$ is a triangulation. In this case, we call it *generic* and [12, Lemma 6.2.8] tells us that all the graphs are forests and especially, the maximal polytopes in the subdivision are represented by trees. We therefore, *refine* our subdivision which means that we construct a triangulation $\mathcal{T}$ for which every covector graph of $\mathcal{T}$ is




FIGURE 4. The covector is replaced by two trees in the refinement.

a forest and contained in a covector graph of $\mathcal{S}$. This idea was already used in [2] to perturb tropical linear inequality systems. We visualize it in Figure 4.

Definition 10. A covector graph G is *infeasible* if and only if there is an apex node in G which is only incident with negative edges. If G is not infeasible we call it *feasible*. G is even *totally infeasible*, if it is infeasible and every coordinate node is incident with a negative edge.

Since we want to preserve the feasibility of our system, we choose to refine our subdivision with the heights defining a *lexicographic triangulation*. By [12, Definition 4.3.8], the lexicographic triangulation for a point configuration with $k \in \mathbb{N}$ points is the regular triangulation with heights $\varepsilon_i \cdot c^i$ for $i \in [k]$ where $(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k) \in \{-, +\}^k$ is a sign vector and c is a sufficiently big positive number.

Now, let $(m_{ji}) = M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ contain the heights for a lexicographic triangulation of $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$ for which we only require that the sign pattern of M is the negative of the sign pattern of Σ and that $m_{ji} \neq \infty \Leftrightarrow \sigma_{ji} \neq \bullet$.

Then by [12, Lemma 2.3.16 & Corollary 2.3.18] we obtain a refinement of $\mathcal{S}$ w.r.t. M by taking the union of the subdivisions obtained by restricting M to the cells of $\mathcal{S}$. Formally this means: If C is a cell in $\mathcal{S}$ then we obtain a regular subdivision of C by restricting M to the vertices of C and denote this subdivision by $C|_M$. The union $\bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{S}} C|_M$ is a triangulation of $\mathcal{F}$ which refines $\mathcal{S}$.

The refinement $\mathcal{R}$ of the subdivision $\mathcal{S}$ with the matrix M fulfills the following:

Lemma 11. *Let G be a maximal covector graph of $\mathcal{S}$ and $G_1, \dots, G_k$ the maximal covector graphs of $\mathcal{R}$ contained in G . Then G is infeasible if and only if G_ℓ is infeasible for every $\ell \in [k]$.*

Proof. If G is infeasible, there is an apex node which is only incident with negative edges. Since each G_ℓ is a connected subgraph of G without isolated nodes it also contains an apex node which is only incident to negative edges. Hence, it is infeasible.

Now, let G be feasible. For the covector graph G we define the matrix $M|_G$ by replacing every entry m_{ji} of M by ∞ for which (i, j) is not an edge of G . By construction, the polytope in the subdivision $\mathcal{S}$ corresponding to the covector graph G is split up in those polytopes whose corresponding graphs occur as maximal covector graphs in the covector decomposition with respect to $M|_G$. Since no apex node in G is only incident with negative arcs, the signed system $(M|_G, \Sigma)$ has the feasible point $\mathbf{0}$ by the choice of M . Then the maximal covector graphs which contain the covector of $\mathbf{0}$ are feasible. This implies the existence of a feasible covector. $\square$

Remark 12. By [12, Lemma 2.3.16], the matrix corresponding to the refined subdivision is obtained by a small perturbation of the entries. This could cause numerical

issues. However, one could execute the algorithm from Section 5 in such a way that it is sufficient to consider the restricted configurations $(M|_G, \Sigma)$.

4.5. Matroid Operations. The following operations are useful for inductive arguments and occur implicitly in our algorithm. Analogously to classical oriented matroids one can define the operations *deletion* and *contraction*. The analogous tropical operations were defined in [5]. Let $(\mathcal{S}, \Sigma)$ be a signed tropical oriented (n, d) -matroid with parameters.

For an apex node $j \in [n]$, the *deletion* $\mathcal{T}_{\setminus j}$ is the set of graphs which arise from the graphs of $\mathcal{T}$ by deleting the node j . These graphs describe the cells on the face $\{e_\ell \mid \ell \in [n] \setminus j\} \times \Delta_{d-1}$. We delete the j th row in the sign matrix. If $(\mathcal{S}, \Sigma)$ is induced by a signed system (A, Σ) then the operation corresponds to deleting or setting to ∞ the j row of A .

For a coordinate node $i \in [d]$, the *contraction* $\mathcal{T}_{/i}$ is the set of graphs which arise from those graphs of $\mathcal{T}$, for which i is isolated, by deleting the node i . These graphs describe the cells on the face $\Delta_{n-1} \times \{e_\ell \mid \ell \in [d] \setminus i\}$. We delete the i th column in the sign matrix. If $(\mathcal{S}, \Sigma)$ is induced by a signed system (A, Σ) then the operation corresponds to deleting or setting to ∞ the i column of A .

For subsets $D \subseteq [d]$ and $N \subseteq [n]$ we obtain the *minor* $\mathcal{T}_{\setminus N, /D}$. By construction, a minor is again a STOM.

Note that the formerly described operations also correspond to classical matroid operations since products of simplices are matroid polytopes in the classical sense; see [17].

Now, we have the terminology to define the feasibility of a STOM. This generalizes the feasibility of tropical linear inequality systems.

Definition 13. A full STOM $(\mathcal{T}, \Sigma)$ is *feasible* if there is a contraction which contains a feasible covector graph, otherwise we call it *infeasible*.

5. ABSTRACT TROPICAL LINEAR PROGRAMMING

The idea of the algorithm is motivated by the following observation for inequality systems. An inequality system is infeasible if and only if every point is covered by the infeasible part of at least one inequality. We try to find a point in the infeasible region which is extremal in the sense that going any further yields a feasible point.

5.1. Prerequisites for the Algorithm. In Section 4, we described a way to modify a given signed tropical oriented matroid $(\mathcal{S}, \tilde{\Sigma})$ to obtain a generic full signed tropical oriented matroid $(\mathcal{T}, \Sigma)$ with sparsely distributed signs. With [4, Proposition 7.2], we obtain the following characterization for the trees t_ℓ in $\mathcal{T}$ which represent the inclusion-wise maximal elements of the subdivision.

Precondition 14.

- (1) Each t_ℓ is a spanning tree.
- (2) For each t_ℓ and each edge e of t_ℓ either $t_\ell - e$ has an isolated node or there is another tree t_i containing $t_\ell - e$.
- (3) There do not exist two trees t_ℓ and t_i , and a cycle C of $K_{d,n}$ which alternates between edges of t_ℓ and t_i .
- (4) Every row of Σ contains exactly one negative entry.

Condition 3 of Precondition 14 is essentially the same as the *comparability* in the axiom system for tropical oriented matroids in [5] and we will use this term in the following.

Inspired by classical oriented matroid programming, cf. [6, 16, 29], we will now describe an algorithm for solving the feasibility problem as an abstraction of the feasibility problem for signed systems. The structure is inspired by the tropicalization of the classical simplex method which was carried out in [3]. However, our pivoting does not depend on coefficients but only on the structure of the STOM.

To emphasize, that covector graphs are indeed an analogue of 'co-vectors', we denote them by y , in this Section. We call a covector graph y on $[d] \sqcup [n]$ a *basic covector* if it is a tree, there are exactly $d - 1$ apex nodes which are incident with a positive and a negative edge and these negative edges cover $d - 1$ coordinate nodes. We call the set of these coordinate nodes in y *captured*. For degree reasons, the other apex nodes necessarily have degree one. We call the apex nodes with degree bigger than one *tight*, the others *loose*.

5.2. Description of the Algorithm. We give just a brief overview of the structure. Our algorithm is split up in several subroutines. The main function, from where the other subroutines are called, is presented in Algorithm 1. There, set of coordinate nodes, corresponding to the dimension, is successively increased. The flexibility in the start values is useful for further theoretical considerations. The loop has $\mathcal{O}(d)$ iterations and for fixed dimension one tries to construct an extreme basic covector. In Algorithm 2, we classify basic covectors based on the notions from Def. 10. Depending on the result, we may have to pivot between basic covectors to find a feasible or totally infeasible basic covector with Algorithm 3. Here, we are left with some freedom in line 3. The while-loop over INTERMEDIATESTEP starting in line 6 corresponds to the traverse of an edge in the simplex method and has $\mathcal{O}(n + d)$ iterations. We do not know the exact number of iterations for the loop starting in line 2, only the upper bound $\mathcal{O}\left(\binom{n}{d}\right)$ given by the possible number of captured coordinate nodes. The steps in Algorithm 4 are very similar to [3, Proposition 4.3] and correspond to the crooked shape of a tropical line. The final two Algorithms 5 and 6 are just black boxes in the abstract case. They are further explained in section 6 for the realizable case where their running time is in $\mathcal{O}((d + n)^4)$.

5.3. Initialization of the Iteration over the Dimension. We ensure that the initialization for Algorithm 1 can be done in the required way. For this, we need a technical lemma which will also be helpful for ensuring the existence of covector graphs with special properties later on.

By the Cayley trick ([12, §9]), triangulations of $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$ are in bijection with fine mixed subdivisions of $n\Delta_{d-1}$. Therefore, we can apply [25, Proposition 2.5] to the collection of bipartite graphs which form a STOM since they correspond to the simplices in a triangulation of $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$. By translating the terms, we obtain the following.

Lemma 15. *Every sequence $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in [d]^n$ with $\sum_{j=1}^n a_j = n + d - 1$ occurs exactly once as a degree sequence of the apex nodes in a tree in $\mathcal{T}$.*

Algorithm 1 Iteration over the dimension**Input:** A tropical oriented matroid $(\mathcal{T}, \Sigma)$ fulfilling Pre. 14**Output:** A totally infeasible basic covector or a feasible covector in a contraction

```

1:  $D \leftarrow$  1-element subset of  $[d]$ 
2:  $\delta \leftarrow$  node in  $[d] \setminus D$ .
3:  $y \leftarrow$  connected covector contracted to  $(D \cup \{\delta\})$   $\triangleright y$  can be chosen basic or
4: feasible
5: while  $D \neq [d]$  do
6:    $check \leftarrow \text{CHECKFEASIBLE}(y, D, \delta)$   $\triangleright$  see Algorithm 2
7:   if  $check = \text{FEASIBLE}$  then
8:     return  $y$ 
9:   else if  $check = \text{TOTALLY-INFEASIBLE}$  then
10:     $D \leftarrow D \cup \{\delta\}$ 
11:     $\delta \leftarrow$  node in  $[d] \setminus D$ .
12:     $y \leftarrow \text{CALCULATEBASICCOVECTOR}(y, \delta)$   $\triangleright$  see Algorithm 6
13:   else
14:     $y \leftarrow \text{FINDEXTREMECOVECTOR}(y)$   $\triangleright$  see Algorithm 3
15:   end if
16: end while
17: return  $y$ 

```

Algorithm 2 Checking feasibility of a basic covector**Input:** A basic covector y on $(D \cup \delta) \sqcup [n]$ where D is captured**Output:** A distinction based on the signs of the edges of y

```

1: procedure  $\text{CHECKFEASIBLE}(y, D, \delta)$ 
2:   if no negative edge is incident with a loose apex and a node in  $D \cup \delta$  then
3:     return FEASIBLE
4:   else if there is a negative edge incident with  $\delta$  then
5:     return TOTALLY-INFEASIBLE
6:   else if there is a negative edge connecting a loose apex node and an  $i \in D$ 
7:     then
8:       return INFEASIBLE
9:   end if
10: end procedure

```

By Lemma 15, in each contraction $\mathcal{T}_{/K}$ of $\mathcal{T}$ onto two coordinate nodes, i.e., $|K| = d - 2$, there is a covector y_j for every apex node $j \in [n]$ for which j has degree 2 and every other apex node has degree 1. If j is incident with two positive edges in y_j for every $j \in [n]$ then all the edges which occur in the y_j are positive and hence, they are all feasible. Otherwise, there exists an apex node $j \in [n]$ for which y_j is a basic covector in $\mathcal{T}_{/K}$. This implies that we can easily find an appropriate start covector in Line 4 of Algorithm 1.

5.4. Find the Next Covector and Increase a Covector. Algorithm 5 is used to determine the covector graph containing a tree with two connected components and Algorithm 6 increases the set of coordinate nodes on which a basic covector is defined. They depend on the way in which the signed tropical oriented matroid is

Algorithm 3 Pivoting between basic covectors**Input:** A basic covector y on $(D \cup \delta) \sqcup [n]$ where D is captured**Output:** A basic covector on $(D \cup \delta) \sqcup [n]$ which is either totally infeasible or feasible

```

1: procedure FINDEXTREMECOVECTOR( $y$ )
2:   while CHECKFEASIBLE( $y, D, \delta$ ) = INFEASIBLE do
3:      $e \leftarrow$  negative edge of the tight apex node  $p$  incident with  $i$  in  $y$ 
4:      $\triangleright$  The coordinate node  $i$  is introduced in line 6 in Algorithm 2.
5:     Denote the set of tight apex nodes of  $y$  by  $N$ .
6:     do INTERMEDIATESTEP( $y, e, i$ )  $\triangleright$  see Algorithm 4
7:     while  $y$  is no basic covector
8:   end while
9: end procedure

```

Algorithm 4 One step between two basic covectors**Input:** A covector graph y which is basic or results from INTERMEDIATESTEP, the accompanying edge e of y and coordinate node i from FINDEXTREMECOVECTOR or INTERMEDIATESTEP

```

1: procedure INTERMEDIATESTEP( $y, e, i$ )
2:    $w, f \leftarrow$  CALCULATENEXTCOVECTOR( $y, e$ )
3:    $q \leftarrow$  the apex node incident with  $f$ 
4:   if  $f$  is positive and  $q$  is adjacent to  $i$  via a negative edge. then
5:      $w$  is a basic covector with set of tight apex nodes  $N \setminus p \cup q$ .
6:   else if  $q$  has degree 3 in  $w$  then
7:      $e \leftarrow$  the positive edge incident with  $q$  in  $y - e = w - f$ .
8:   else
9:      $e \leftarrow$  the edge incident with  $q$  in  $y - e = w - f$ .
10:  end if
11:   $y \leftarrow w$ 
12: end procedure

```

Algorithm 5 Determine the covector graph containing $y - e$ but not y .**Input:** A covector graph y and an edge e of y **Output:** The covector graph $\neq y$ containing $y - e$ which exists by Pre. 14

```

procedure CALCULATENEXTCOVECTOR( $y, e$ )
   $w \leftarrow$  unique covector  $\neq y$  containing  $y - e$ .
   $f \leftarrow w - (y - e)$ 
  return  $w, f$ 
end procedure

```

given. For the case of a realizable STOM the procedure CALCULATENEXTCOVECTOR is explained by Proposition 27 and CALCULATEBASICCOVECTOR by Proposition 31. For the more abstract case of non-regular subdivisions, we consider the two procedures just as oracles which provide with the required covector. We prove that those operations are possible in an abstract STOM.

Algorithm 6 Increase a covector from $D \sqcup [n]$ to $(D \cup \delta) \sqcup [n]$

Input: A basic covector y on $D \sqcup [n]$, which contains a maximal matching of negative edges, and a coordinate node $\delta \in [d] \setminus D$.

Output: A basic covector on $(D \cup \delta) \sqcup [n]$ where D is captured.

procedure CALCULATEBASICCOVECTOR(y, δ)

$N \leftarrow$ set of $|D|$ apices for which for each node $i \in D$ there is node $j \in N$ adjacent to i via a negative edge.

$y \leftarrow$ unique covector on $(D \cup \delta) \sqcup [n]$ for which the nodes in N have degree 2.

return y

end procedure




FIGURE 5. Increasing a totally infeasible basic covector

Lemma 16. *The procedure CALCULATENEXTCOVECTOR in Algorithm 5 yields a covector which is a spanning tree.*

Proof. Precondition 14(2) yields the existence of the next tree if the $y - e$ does not have an isolated node. By the definition of q in Algorithm 4, the three possibilities given by Algorithm 3 in line 3 and Algorithm 4 in lines 7 and 9 do not lead to a covector with an isolated node. $\square$

The existence of the solution to CALCULATEBASICCOVECTOR in Algorithm 6 is more involved and is explained by the next Lemma. Notice that this procedure is only called if the input basic covector y is totally infeasible and hence contains a maximal matching μ which covers D and consists solely of negative edges where we used the notation from Algorithm 1. Furthermore, one can think of the set D in the following Lemma as the newly assigned set from line 10 in Algorithm 1.

Lemma 17. *Let $D \subseteq [d]$, $\delta \in [d] \setminus D$ and $N \subseteq [n]$ with $|N| = |D|$. Furthermore, let $\hat{y}$ be a covector graph in the contraction $\mathcal{T}_{([d] \setminus D)}$ containing a perfect matching μ on $D \sqcup N$.*

Then there is a unique covector graph y in the contraction $\mathcal{T}_{([d] \setminus (D \cup \{\delta\}))}$, which has degree 2 for every node in N and which contains μ .

In particular, the procedure CALCULATEBASICCOVECTOR in Algorithm 6 returns a basic covector graph on $(D \cup \{\delta\}) \sqcup [n]$ where D is captured.

Proof. Applying Lemma 15 to $\mathcal{T}_{/([d] \setminus (D \cup \{\delta\}))}$ yields the existence of a covector graph which has degree 2 for every node in N and degree 1 for the nodes in $[n] \setminus N$. By Hall's marriage theorem (cf. [27, Theorem 22.1]), the induced subgraph of y on $(D \cup \{\delta\}) \sqcup N$ contains a matching on $\hat{D} \sqcup N$ for every $|D|$ -element subset $\hat{D}$ of $(D \cup \{\delta\})$. Especially, it contains a perfect matching on $D \sqcup N$. By the definition of $\mathcal{T}_{/([d] \setminus D)}$, there is a covector graph $\tilde{y}$ in $\mathcal{T}_{/([d] \setminus (D \cup \{\delta\}))}$ extending y . The comparability condition from Precondition 14(3) yields for the two graphs $\tilde{y}$ and y that they must contain the same matching μ on $D \sqcup N$. $\square$

5.5. Pivoting between Basic Covectors. In this subsection, we want to analyse Algorithm 3 and 4. We use the notation from there. In particular, f is the edge in which $y - e$ and w differ, q is the apex node incident with f .

Let the *length of a path* in a graph be the number of nodes contained in the path. Define the *distance of an edge e* in the covector graph y as the minimum of the two lengths of the paths from a fixed coordinate node δ to the nodes which are incident with e . Note that the path between two nodes in a tree is unique. We call the edge e *even* in y if the distance to the coordinate node δ is even, otherwise *odd*. We call this property the *parity of an edge* in y .

Let $y_1, \dots, y_{k+1}$ be a fixed sequence of connected covector graphs which arise consecutively during the procedure `FINDEXTREMECOVECTOR` in Algorithm 3. Then we can write $y_2 = y_1 - e_1 + f_1, y_3 = y_2 - e_2 + f_2, \dots, y_k = y_{k-1} - e_{k-1} + f_{k-1} = y_{k+1}$ for appropriate edges e_ℓ and f_ℓ . Here, y_1 is the input covector and we fix D and δ from the input.

Lemma 18. *Let y_ℓ and $y_{\ell+1} = y_\ell - e_\ell + f_\ell$ be two consecutive covector graphs with $\ell \in [k]$. Then e_ℓ is even in y_ℓ and f_ℓ is odd in $y_{\ell+1}$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction. The first covector graph y_1 in the iteration is a basic covector.

Recall that no tight apex is incident with δ via a negative edge and two negative edges, which are incident with a tight apex node, are never adjacent. Traversing the paths emerging from δ , we conclude that all the negative edges which are incident with a tight apex node are even. Note that, for the basic covector y_1 , we remove exactly one such negative edge e_1 in Algorithm 3 line 3.

Now, consider the union of $y_{\ell-1}$ and y_ℓ which is $Y_\ell = y_{\ell-1} + f_{\ell-1} = y_\ell + e_{\ell-1}$. There is a unique fundamental cycle in Y_ℓ which contains $f_{\ell-1}$ and e_ℓ . Considering the (unique) path from the coordinate node δ to e_ℓ containing $f_{\ell-1}$, we conclude that the parities of $f_{\ell-1}$ and e_ℓ in y_ℓ have to be different. Otherwise the cycle would alternate between edges of $y_{\ell-1}$ and y_ℓ . That would contradict the comparability. Furthermore, $f_{\ell-1}$ and e_ℓ have different parity in y_ℓ since they are incident with the same apex node as defined in Algorithm 4 lines 7 and 9.

By iterating the two arguments, which corresponds to the loops in the lines 2 and 6 of Algorithm 3, the claim follows. $\square$

Remark 19. The path between two basic covectors which is described here is very similar to the path described in [3, Proposition 4.1] between two *basic points*.

Now, consider the case that none of the covectors between (excluding) y_1 and y_{k+1} is basic. This means that the sequence $y_2, \dots, y_k$ only consists of consecutively arising y in Line 11 of Algorithm 4. Such a sequence is depicted in Figure 6.




FIGURE 6. A possible sequence of covector graphs starting with an infeasible and ending with a feasible basic covector. Negative edges are dashed, coordinate nodes left, apex nodes right.

Lemma 20. *Let C_ℓ be the set of nodes in the connected component of the coordinate node δ in $y_\ell - e_\ell$ and q_ℓ the apex node, which is incident with f_ℓ , for $\ell \in [k]$. Then $q_\ell \in C_{\ell+1}$ and $C_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq C_k$.*

Proof. Fix an arbitrary $\ell \in [k-1]$. At first, we show that the apex node q_ℓ is not contained in C_ℓ . Assume that f_ℓ is incident with an apex node in C_ℓ . Then the unique path from δ to the coordinate node incident with f_ℓ in $y_{\ell+1}$ contains q_ℓ since it connects the two components of $y_\ell - e_\ell$. Therefore, the distance of f_ℓ in $y_{\ell+1}$ is the length of the path from δ to q_ℓ . Since $y_{\ell+1}$ is a bipartite tree, this path has even length and f_ℓ is even in $y_{\ell+1}$. However, this contradicts Lemma 18.

The former implies that the edge f_ℓ connects q_ℓ with C_ℓ as $y_{\ell+1}$ is connected. Furthermore, with the choice of $e_{\ell+1}$ in Algorithm 4 lines 7 and 9, the other endpoint of $e_{\ell+1}$ cannot lie in C_ℓ , as otherwise, $q_\ell \in C_\ell$. Therefore, q_ℓ is contained in $C_{\ell+1}$ and $C_\ell \subseteq C_{\ell+1}$.

Summarizing, we obtain $q_\ell \in C_{\ell+1} \setminus C_\ell$ and $C_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq C_k$ follows. $\square$

Corollary 21. *The while-loop starting in line 6 of Algorithm 3, which iterates over the procedure INTERMEDIATESTEP from Algorithm 4, does not cycle and yields a new basic covector after at most n steps. Furthermore, the negative edges of the tight apex nodes are not incident with δ .*

Proof. Since there are only n apex nodes and the C_ℓ in the former Lemma are increased by one apex node in each iteration, the loop has to stop after at most n steps. During the iteration, the degree sequence of the apex nodes in the graphs $y_\ell - e_\ell$ is constant and the negative edges incident with the apex nodes in N , where N is defined in line 5 of Algorithm 3, are not changed. Algorithm 2 line 6 ensures the existence of an apex node which serves as an appropriate q in line 4 in Algorithm 4. Hence, the covector in line 5 is indeed basic. $\square$

We still have to check if the procedure FINDEXTREMECOVECTOR in Algorithm 3 terminates after finitely many steps. For this, let $y_1, \dots, y_{k+1}$ again be a fixed sequence of connected covector graphs which arise consecutively during the procedure FINDEXTREMECOVECTOR in Algorithm 3 where y_1 and y_{k+1} are basic covectors; here, also covectors y_ℓ with $1 < \ell < k+1$ can be basic.

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the set of edges which are contained in all the graphs $y_1, \dots, y_{k+1}$. Denote by $\mathcal{E}(\delta)$ the connected subgraph containing δ in the graph on $(D \cup \{\delta\}) \sqcup [n]$ with edge set $\mathcal{E}$ and by X the subset of the coordinate nodes which are connected to δ in $\mathcal{E}(\delta)$.

Lemma 22. *For $\ell \in [k]$, let Z_ℓ be the subset of the apex nodes which are adjacent to a node in X in the covector graph $y_\ell - e_\ell$. Then $Z_1, \dots, Z_k$ is an inclusion-wise non-decreasing sequence and f_ℓ is not incident with Z_ℓ . Eventually, there is an $\ell \in [k]$ for which e_ℓ is incident with a node from $Z_{\ell-1}$. In particular, $y_1 \neq y_{k+1}$.*

Proof. To show that the Z_ℓ form a non-decreasing sequence fix an $\ell \in [k]$ and consider the covector graph $y_{\ell-1} - e_{\ell-1}$. If the next covector, y_ℓ , is a basic covector, then e_ℓ is a negative edge by 3.3. We argue that this negative edge cannot be incident with X . Assume that it would be incident with the coordinate node $s \in X$. By construction, the edges of $\mathcal{E}$ lie in y_1 . Recall from the proof of Lemma 18 that the negative edges which are incident with the tight apex nodes of y_1 are even. Especially, all the nodes in X except for δ are connected to a tight apex node via a negative edge. Hence, s is incident with another tight apex node via a negative edge, a contradiction. Therefore, Z_ℓ does not decrease in this case.

If y_ℓ is not a basic covector, by Lemma 20, the apex node q_ℓ , which is incident with f_ℓ , is not contained in the connected component of δ in $y_{\ell-1} - e_{\ell-1}$. Hence, it is not contained in $Z_{\ell-1}$. This implies that $Z_\ell \supseteq Z_{\ell-1}$.

To show that f_ℓ is not incident with Z_ℓ , assume that there are two consecutive covectors y_ℓ and $y_{\ell+1} = y_\ell - e_\ell + f_\ell$ for which f_ℓ is incident with q_ℓ in Z_ℓ . Since f_ℓ connects the two components of $y_\ell - e_\ell$ the path from δ to the coordinate node incident with f_ℓ contains q_ℓ . With the bipartiteness of $y_{\ell+1}$, this implies that f_ℓ is even in $y_{\ell+1}$, contradicting Lemma 18.

To prove $y_1 \neq y_{k+1}$, note that X cannot be the set $D \cup \{\delta\}$ unless $k = 0$. Hence, there is a coordinate node $h \in (D \cup \delta)$ with $h \notin X$. Notice that $\mathcal{E}(\delta)$ is a tree and the leafs are apex nodes since $Z_1, \dots, Z_k$ is an inclusion-wise non-decreasing sequence. Therefore, there has to be some $\ell_0 \in [k]$ for which e_{ℓ_0} is incident with a leaf of $\mathcal{E}(\delta)$ and hence, with Z_{ℓ_0} .

Finally, with the formerly defined index ℓ_0 , we conclude that y_{ℓ_1} is different from y_{ℓ_0} for $\ell_1 > \ell_0$ as the edge e_{ℓ_0} is removed but cannot be added again. This concludes the claim. $\square$

Remark 23. Geometrically, the set X corresponds to a lower dimensional tropical hyperplane, which contains all the points $y_1, \dots, y_{k+1}$. It is given by the intersection of the boundaries of the tropical halfspaces which correspond to the apex nodes which are internal nodes of $\mathcal{E}(\delta)$.

Lemma 22 implies that `FINDEXTREMECOVECTOR` eventually stops at some point and especially does not cycle.

To see that the case distinction in Algorithm 2 is complete, note that, by Corollary 21, in line 4 only loose apices can be incident with the negative edge. Therefore, the result of `FINDEXTREMECOVECTOR` in Algorithm 3 is indeed evaluated by `CHECKFEASIBLE` in Algorithm 2 either as `FEASIBLE` or `TOTALLY-INFEASIBLE`. Hence, the while-loop in line 5 of Algorithm 1 is traversed at most $2 \cdot d$ times as the cardinality of D always increases if (`check` = `TOTALLY-INFEASIBLE`) is true.

Remark 24. Lemma 22 provides counting arguments to determine the running time of Algorithm 3. By Lemma 15, each basic covector on $D \sqcup [n]$ is given by a $|D|$ -subset of $[n]$. This implies the upper bound $\binom{n}{|D|}$ for the number of iterations. A more detailed examination of the running time of this algorithm is of interest to decide if it is polynomial in d and n . This analysis is posed as Question 44.

We subsume the result of our considerations of this section.

Theorem 25. *Algorithm 1 stops after finitely many steps and the result y fulfills: Either y is a feasible basic covector graph of a contraction of $(\mathcal{T}, \Sigma)$ or it is a totally infeasible basic covector graph of $(\mathcal{T}, \Sigma)$.*

6. FEASIBILITY OF SIGNED SYSTEMS

In this section, we want to justify that the result of the abstract algorithm for generic full STOMs which were blown up by the splitting of apex nodes yields results for arbitrary signed systems. Furthermore, we describe the computation of `CALCULATEBASICCOVECTOR` from Algorithm 6 and `CALCULATENEXTCOVECTOR` from Algorithm 5 in the case where the STOM is realizable.

6.1. Consequence of Total Infeasibility. If a generic full STOM $(\mathcal{T}, \Xi)$, for which each row of Ξ has only one $-$ entry, contains a totally infeasible covector graph G then, by definition, there is a d -subset of the apex nodes $N \subseteq [n]$, for which each node in $[d]$ is connected to a node in N via a negative edge. In particular, there is a matching μ of negative edges on $[d] \sqcup N$ in G . This helps to prove the following.

Lemma 26. *If the covector graph G in the generic full STOM $(\mathcal{T}, \Xi)$ is totally infeasible, then in every covector graph H of any contraction of $(\mathcal{T}, \Xi)$ there is a node in N which is only incident with a negative edge. Especially, $(\mathcal{T}, \Xi)$ is infeasible.*

Proof. At first, by definition, G is infeasible.

Notice that each covector graph in a contraction is constructed from a covector graph of $(\mathcal{T}, \Xi)$ and this is done in such a way that feasibility or infeasibility carries over to the contracted covector.

Now, let H be any covector graph in $(\mathcal{T}, \Xi)$. Assume H is feasible. This implies that each apex node $j \in N$ is incident with an edge which does not lie in μ . Let η be the set of these edges and D the subset of the coordinate nodes $[d]$ which is covered by η . Then the graph on $D \sqcup N$ with edge set $\mu|_D \cup \eta$, where $\mu|_D$ are those edges in μ incident with D , contains a cycle C . This follows as it has $|D| + |N|$ nodes and $|\mu|_D| + |\eta| \geq |D| + |N|$ edges. Since every node in D is only incident with one edge from $\mu|_D$ and every node in N is only incident with one edge from η and at most one edge from $\mu|_D$, the cycle C has to be alternating between μ and η . However, this contradicts the comparability in Precondition 14. $\square$

6.2. Computations for Signed Systems. In this subsection we propound the computation of `CALCULATENEXTCOVECTOR` from Algorithm 5 and `CALCULATEBASICCOVECTOR` from Algorithm 6 in the case where the STOM is realizable. Let G be a covector graph for $A \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^{n \times d}$ with two connected components and let I_1 and I_2 be the sets of coordinate nodes in these components. Construct the weighted directed bipartite graph Γ on the node set $[d] \sqcup [n]$ such that $(i, j) \in [d] \times [n]$ is an

arc with weight a_{ij} if $a_{ij} \neq \infty$ and $(i, j) \notin G$ and $(j, i) \in [n] \times [d]$ is an arc with weight $-a_{ij}$ if $(i, j) \in G$. This allows us to compute `CALCULATENEXTCOVECTOR`.

Proposition 27. *There are at most two covector graphs containing G . They are obtained by adding all those edges to G which lie on a shortest path in Γ from I_1 to I_2 or from I_2 to I_1 .*

Proof. If we consider the polyhedral cell in the covector decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^d$ defined by G then [22, Proposition 30] represents this as a face of the *envelope*. By [13, Proposition 17], the dimension of the cell defined by G modulo the $\mathbb{R} \cdot \mathbf{1}$ lineality equals the number of connected components of G minus 1. Hence the face is an edge of the envelope. Furthermore, [22, Lemma 7] shows that the *weighted digraph polyhedron* for Γ is this face. Here, G encodes those inequalities which are attained with equality along this face. Therefore, we seek for the equations on the vertices of this edge. Now [22, Lemma 2 & Lemma 3] yield that the facet defining inequalities of the polyhedral cell, which in this case are its vertices, are given by shortest paths in Γ connecting I_1 and I_2 . $\square$

Remark 28. Notice that the just described operation is very similar to intermediate steps in the Hungarian method in the search for augmenting paths. Furthermore, in the generic situation, there is only one edge in G missing to make it into a tree. In this case, only a single source shortest path computation is enough.

Starting from a covector graph, the next Lemma allows us to compute a point with this covector graph.

Lemma 29. *Let G be a connected covector graph with coordinate nodes i and ℓ w.r.t. $A \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^d$. The coefficients of A define weights on the edges of G . Then by setting $x_i = 0$ and x_ℓ to the alternating sum of the weights along a path from i to ℓ , where the weight of the edge incident to i gets a positive sign, we obtain a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $G_A(x) = G$.*

Proof. Let $i = i_1, j_1, \dots, i_s, j_s, i_{s+1} = \ell$ be a path from i to ℓ in G . By the definition of a covector graph, we obtain the sequence of equations $a_{j_t i_t} + x_{i_t} = a_{j_t i_{t+1}} + x_{i_{t+1}}$ for all the tuples (i_t, j_t, i_{t+1}) with $t \in [s]$. Summing up these equations yields $\sum_{t=1}^s (a_{j_t i_t} + x_{i_t}) = \sum_{t=1}^s (a_{j_t i_{t+1}} + x_{i_{t+1}})$. With $x_{i_1} = x_i = 0$ and $x_{i_{s+1}} = x_\ell$ this reduces to $x_\ell = \sum_{t=1}^s a_{j_t i_t} - \sum_{t=1}^s a_{j_t i_{t+1}}$. This is exactly our claim and we see that the sign in front of $a_{j_1 i_1}$ is positive. This implies the claim, since the hereby defined point x indeed fulfills the equations imposed by G and G is supposed to be a covector graph w.r.t. A . $\square$

The next Lemma is similar to [26, Theorem 5.3]. We use it to prove Proposition 31. For a generic matrix $T = [t^{(1)}, \dots, t^{(d-1)}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(d-1) \times d}$ we denote by $\mathcal{V}(T)$ the point $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for which the minimum in $T \odot x$ is attained twice in every row. Equivalently, the covector $G_T(\mathcal{V}(T))$ is a tree and every apex node has degree 2. Furthermore, let $T_{/i}$ for $i \in [d]$ be the submatrix of T which is obtained from T by removing the i th column. This corresponds to a contraction.

Lemma 30. *The graph G on $[d] \sqcup [d-1]$ is the covector graph $G_T(\mathcal{V}(T))$ if and only if it is the union of the minimal perfect matchings, in the sense of Proposition 3, on $T^{(-i)}$ for $i \in [d]$.*

Proof. By Lemma 15, the covector graph $G_T(\mathcal{V}(T))$, given by the degree condition for the apex nodes, exists and is unique.

Now, let G be the graph on $[d] \sqcup [d-1]$ which is the union of the minimal matchings on $T^{(-i)}$ for $i \in [d]$. By Proposition 3, G is a valid covector graph, since every submatching of the described graph is a minimal matching. By the genericity, the covector graph has to be a tree.

For an arbitrary apex node there are at least two minimal perfect matchings which contain this node. This follows by fixing the edge (i, k) in one matching and then considering the matching on $([d+1] \setminus k) \sqcup [d]$. Therefore, every apex node has degree at least 2. Since the covector graph has to be a tree, there can only be $d+1+d-1 = 2 \cdot d$ edges. Hence, the apex nodes have exactly degree 2. $\square$

We call a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ *generic* if all covector graphs for A are forests. We describe the calculation for `CALCULATEBASICCOVECTOR` from Algo. 6.

Let G be a covector graph on $[d] \sqcup [n]$ w.r.t. the generic matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ for which there is a $(d-1)$ -element subset N of the apex nodes in G with degree 2. By deleting the other apex nodes we obtain the situation of the former Lemma 30 which implies the structure of G restricted to $[d] \sqcup N$. Since G has to be a tree, the other apex nodes in $[n] \setminus N$ have to have degree 1. Fix a $j \in [n] \setminus N$. Then there is unique node $i \in [d]$ adjacent to j . We already know that G contains a matching on $([d] \setminus \{i\}) \sqcup N$. Together with the edge (i, j) this yields a perfect matching on $[d] \sqcup (N \cup \{j\})$. By Prop. 3 this has to be a minimal matching which proves the following.

Proposition 31. *Let G be a covector graph on $[d] \sqcup [n]$ w.r.t. the generic matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ for which there is a $(d-1)$ -element subset N of the apex nodes with degree 2. Then G is the union of the minimal perfect matchings on $([d] \setminus \{i\}) \sqcup N$, in the sense of Proposition 3, for every $i \in [d]$ and the minimal perfect matchings on $[d] \sqcup (N \cup \{j\})$ for every $j \in [n] \setminus N$.*

6.3. Feasibility of Signed Systems. For a signed system (A, Σ) we can apply splitting of apex nodes, extension and refinement and obtain a generic full STOM $(\mathcal{T}, \Xi)$. In this section, we want to show that the result of Algorithm 1 for $(\mathcal{T}, \Xi)$ is a certificate for the feasibility or infeasibility of (A, Σ) .

Consider a signed system (A, Σ) for $A \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^{n \times d}$ with corresponding STOM (S, Σ) . Applying splitting of apex nodes and extension, by replacing the ∞ entries with sufficiently large numbers, we obtain a system $(\hat{A}(\Omega), \Xi)$ for some $\hat{A} \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^{m \times d}$ and $\hat{A}(\Omega) \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ with $m \geq n$, such that every row of Ξ contains exactly one negative entry. Finally, we refine and obtain a system $\hat{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d}$ for which the corresponding STOM $(\mathcal{T}, \Xi)$ fulfills the prerequisites of abstract tropical linear programming.

At first, consider the case that the result G of Algo. 1 is **totally infeasible**.

Theorem 32. *If $(\mathcal{T}, \Xi)$ contains a totally infeasible covector graph then $(\infty, \dots, \infty) \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^d$ is the only solution of the signed system (A, Σ) .*

Proof. By Lemma 26, every covector graph in $(\mathcal{T}, \Xi)$ contains an apex node which is only incident with a negative arc and hence infeasible. Now, Lemma 11 implies that also every covector graph in the STOM w.r.t. $(\hat{A}(\Omega), \Xi)$ is infeasible.

Consider $x \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^d \setminus \{\infty, \dots, \infty\}$ and let $K = [d] \setminus \text{supp}(x)$. The minima in each row of the calculation $\hat{A}(\Omega) \odot x$ is attained for the same indices in $[d]$ if we would replace the entries of x with index in K by sufficiently large numbers.

The former reasons imply that there is an apex node $j \in [n]$ for which the corresponding inequality is not fulfilled by x . It is of the form

$$\bigoplus_{\ell \in L_1} \Omega_{(j,\ell)} \odot x_\ell \oplus \bigoplus_{\ell \in L_2} \hat{a}_{j,\ell} \odot x_\ell \leq \hat{a}_{j,i} + x_i ,$$

for appropriate $\Omega_{(j,\ell)}$ and a decomposition $L_1 \cup L_2$ of $[d] \setminus \{i\}$ with $\hat{a}_{j,\ell} \neq \infty$ for $\ell \in L_2 \cup \{i\}$. Replacing the Ω -coefficients with ∞ does not change the fact, that x does not fulfill this inequality, as it only increases the left hand side of the inequality. Since, by Lemma 6, the splitting operation is only an equivalent reformulation of the inequality system, x is infeasible for (A, Σ) . $\square$

Now, let G be a **feasible** covector graph on the node set $(D \cup \delta) \sqcup [n]$ in $(\mathcal{T}_K, \Xi_K)$, with $K = [d] \setminus (D \cup \delta)$, which arises as result of Algo. 1. Then δ is not incident with a negative edge by Corollary 21. Let $\hat{G}$ be the covector graph, which contains G , in the contraction of the STOM induced by $(\hat{A}(\Omega), \Xi)$. With Lemma 29, we can construct a point $x \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^d$ from $\hat{G}$ by setting x_δ to 0, the other coordinates x_ℓ for $\ell \in D$ to the alternating sum of the weights corresponding to the edges in a path from δ to ℓ in $\hat{G}$ and $x_\ell = \infty$ for $\ell \in K$. Since $\hat{G}$ is feasible, also x is feasible for $(\hat{A}(\Omega), \Xi)$. Now, construct z from x by replacing every Ω by ∞ .

Theorem 33. *The point $z \neq (\infty, \dots, \infty)$ is feasible for the signed system (A, Σ) and $\text{supp}(z) \cap (D \cup \{\delta\}) \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Since δ is not incident with a negative edge and no two negative edges are adjacent in the feasible basic covector G , iterating along the paths from δ to the other coordinate nodes proves that the positive edges have odd distance from δ in G . As $\hat{G}$ contains G and therefore also the paths in G , Lemma 29 implies that no coordinate of x contains an Ω -entry with a negative sign.

Let H be the subgraph of $\hat{G}$ obtained by deleting those edges for which the corresponding weight is ∞ in A . Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the connected component of δ in H . The former consideration implies that the coordinates of z with index in $\mathcal{C}$ are finite and the others are infinite, especially $z \neq (\infty, \dots, \infty)$ and $\text{supp}(z) \cap (D \cup \{\delta\}) \neq \emptyset$.

Now consider a row $\bar{a}$ of $\hat{A}(\Omega)$ and let ℓ be the coordinate which is marked by a negative sign. Then $\min_{i \in [d] \setminus \{\ell\}} (\bar{a}_i + x_i) \leq \bar{a}_\ell + x_\ell$, since x is feasible. If $\min_{i \in [d] \setminus \{\ell\}} (\bar{a}_i + x_i)$ contains some Ω as summand also $\bar{a}_\ell + x_\ell$ has to contain some Ω as a summand by the construction of the Ω . This implies that both sides of the inequality are set to ∞ by the transition from $\hat{A}(\Omega)$ to $\hat{A}$ and x to z . If $\min_{i \in [d] \setminus \{\ell\}} (\bar{a}_i + x_i)$ does not contain any Ω as summand it anyway remains finite and the corresponding inequality remains valid. $\square$

Combining Theorem 32 and Theorem 33 yields Theorem 34.

Theorem 34. *If $(\mathcal{T}, \Xi)$ contains a totally infeasible covector graph then the vector $(\infty, \dots, \infty) \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^d$ is the only solution of the signed system (A, Σ) . Otherwise, there is a feasible point $z \neq (\infty, \dots, \infty)$ for (A, Σ) .*

7. GENERALIZED COVECTOR GRAPHS

The arguments used for Theorem 32 and 33 motivate the consideration of a generalization of the covector graphs from Definition 1. Moreover, the *generalized covector graphs* are useful to express duality and further, the connection to strategies of mean payoff games in Section 8.




FIGURE 7. The grey bars indicate the *infeasible* regions. The supports of the feasible sets defined by the halfspaces corresponding to signed systems are different.

7.1. A General Feasibility Criterion by Covector Graphs. Define $\mathbb{T}\mathbb{A}^d = \mathbb{T}_{\min}^d \setminus \{(\infty, \dots, \infty)\}$. Let x be a point in $\mathbb{T}\mathbb{A}^d$. Then the *generalized covector graph* of x is the bipartite graph on the node set $[d] \sqcup [n]$ containing an edge $(i, j) \in [d] \times [n]$ if and only if

$$a_{ji} + x_i = \min \{ a_{jk} + x_k \mid k \in \text{supp}(x), a_{jk} \neq \infty \} \neq \infty .$$

In contrast to covector graphs of points in $\mathbb{R}^d$ the generalized covector graphs possibly have isolated apex nodes.

We obtain the following more general version of Proposition 2.

Proposition 35. *A point $x \in \mathbb{T}\mathbb{A}^d$ is feasible for the signed system (A, Σ) if and only if no apex node is only incident with negative edges in the generalized covector graph $G_A(x)$.*

Proof. Fix a $j \in [n]$ and consider the corresponding inequality

$$\bigoplus_{\sigma_{ji}=+, i \in [d]} a_{ji} \odot x_i \leq \bigoplus_{\sigma_{ji}=-, i \in [d]} a_{ji} \odot x_i .$$

If j has no neighbors in $G_A(x)$ then both sides of the inequality are ∞ and the inequality is fulfilled. If j is only incident to negative edges the right hand side is surely smaller and the inequality is not fulfilled. Otherwise, it is a valid inequality. $\square$

Now, we can extend the notions of feasibility from Definition 10 to generalized covector graphs.

Definition 36. A (generalized) covector graph G is *infeasible* if there is an apex node which is only incident with negative edges. If G is not infeasible we call it *feasible*. A covector graph G is *sufficiently infeasible* and *negatively covers* $D \subseteq [d]$ if G is infeasible and there is a subset $N \subseteq [n]$, for which $D = \bigcup_{j \in N} \text{supp}(a_j)$ and in $G|_{D \sqcup N}$ every coordinate and apex node is covered by a negative edge.

The sufficiently infeasible covector graphs correspond to the generalized cycles with negative weight in [24].

Note that a generalized covector graph can also be the empty graph and the corresponding point is feasible. In general, the empty graph is the covector graph of $(\infty, \dots, \infty)$. This is not the case, if the support of all the apices is contained in a common proper subset of $[d]$.

Let (A, Σ) be a signed system with STOM $(\mathcal{S}, \Sigma)$ and $A(\Omega)$ the coefficient matrix for an extension with $\mathcal{R}$ as its set of covector graphs. Construct the set of bipartite graphs $\mathcal{T}$ from the covectors in $\mathcal{R}$ by deleting in every graph those edges with an Ω weight. By Lemma 8, the graphs in $\mathcal{S}$ contain only additional edges if their weight is an Ω . We conclude the following.

Proposition 37. *The generalized covectors w.r.t. A are exactly the covectors in $\mathcal{T}$.*

The next Theorem presents how sufficiently infeasible covector graphs restrict the support of feasible points. It generalizes Lemma 26.

Theorem 38. *If $(\mathcal{S}, \Sigma)$ contains a sufficiently infeasible covector graph G which negatively covers D , then $\text{supp}(x) \subseteq [d] \setminus D$ for every feasible point x of (A, Σ) .*

Proof. Let $N \subseteq [n]$ be a set of apex nodes, for which $D = \bigcup_{j \in N} \text{supp}(a_j)$, and let μ be a set of negative edges of G covering D and N .

Fix the covector graph H of a point x with $\text{supp}(x) \cap D \neq \emptyset$. Let $J \subseteq N$ such that each $j \in J$ is not isolated in H . By our assumption, J is not empty, because of $D = \bigcup_{j \in N} \text{supp}(a_j)$.

Assume that H is feasible. Then each apex node in J is incident with an edge that is not in μ . Let η be a set of edges disjoint from μ for which each node in J is incident to exactly one edge in η . Now, we can construct a cycle, which alternates between μ and η in the following way. We start at an arbitrary node p_1 in J , go to the node p_2 which is adjacent to p_1 in η and then go back to a point p_3 which is adjacent to p_2 in μ . Since p_2 is not isolated in η , x_{p_2} is in $\text{supp}(x)$. This implies that p_3 is in J by the existence of an a_j with $p_2 \in \text{supp}(a_j)$. Iterating this process yields the alternating cycle. However, this contradicts the comparability of G and H in the Precondition 14. Hence, H is infeasible and so is x . $\square$

To conclude this subsection, we show how the algorithm from Section 5 can be used to find a sufficiently infeasible covector graph for a signed system.

We define the set $S \subseteq [d]$ as the union of the sets $\text{supp}(x)$ where $x \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^d$ is feasible for (A, Σ) . Note that S is also the support of a feasible point due to fact that the feasible set is closed under $\oplus$.

Theorem 39. *There is a sufficiently infeasible covector graph H which negatively covers $([d] \setminus S)$.*

Proof. Again, we transform (A, Σ) to its splitting $(\hat{A}, \Xi)$, extend it to $(\hat{A}(\Omega), \Xi)$ and refine to $(\tilde{A}, \Xi)$.

Now, define $K = [d] \setminus S$. Starting Algo. 1 with a 2-element subset of K and increasing it until $K \subset D \cup \{\delta\}$, where $\delta \notin K$, yields a feasible covector graph G in a contraction of the STOM of $(\tilde{A}, \Xi)$ on $(D \cup \{\delta\}) \sqcup [n]$.

We can construct a point x with support $D \cup \{\delta\}$ w.r.t. $\hat{A}(\Omega)$ in the same way as for Theorem 33. Then its covector graph $\bar{G}$ is feasible and there is a subset $M \subseteq [n]$ for which each apex node in M is incident with negative and positive edges and the negative edges incident with M cover D . Now, we want to determine the covector graph of x w.r.t. to $\hat{A}$. For this, consider an apex node j which is incident with a negative edge in $\bar{G}$. As the weights corresponding to negative edges are finite, the tropical product of the j th row of $\hat{A}(\Omega)$ with x remains the same if we replace the Ω entries of $\hat{A}(\Omega)$ with ∞ . Hence, the covector graph $\hat{G}$ of x w.r.t. $\hat{A}$ contains all the edges which are negative in $\bar{G}$. Furthermore, all the coordinates of x with index in K have to contain an Ω summand; otherwise setting these entries to ∞ would yield a feasible point of (A, Σ) as in Theorem 33 whose support contains an element of $K = [d] \setminus S$ contradicting the definition of S .

Let I be the subset of those coordinate nodes $i \in D \cup \{\delta\}$ for which x_i contains an Ω summand. Let J be the set apex nodes which is incident with some node i in I via a negative edge; notice that $J \subseteq M$. Then for each $j \in J$, the product $\hat{a}_j \odot x$ contains an Ω summand by definition of a covector graph, where $\hat{a}_j$ is the j th row of $\hat{A}$. Since the Ω are bigger than any sum of the finite entries of $\hat{A}$, this implies that x_ℓ contains an Ω summand or $\hat{a}_{j,\ell} = \infty$ for each $\ell \in [d]$. Hence, the entries of the submatrix of $\hat{A}$ labeled by $I \times J$ are ∞ . Furthermore, as x has support $\supset K$, it is infeasible.

Therefore, the covector graph $\hat{G}$ w.r.t. $\hat{A}$ is sufficiently infeasible and covers I . However, Theorem 38 yields that $\text{supp}(x) \subseteq [d] \setminus I$ for every feasible point x of $(\hat{A}, \Xi)$. This implies $[d] \setminus K \subseteq [d] \setminus I$ and with $K \subseteq I$ we obtain $K = I$.

Finally, resulting from Lemma 6, the desired covector graph H w.r.t. A is formed from $\bar{G}$ by uniting the split apex nodes and adding isolated nodes for $[d] \setminus (D \cup \{\delta\})$. Since the support of the apices does not change in this process, the claim follows. $\square$

7.2. Tropical duality. Generalized covectors are symmetric in the partition of their vertex set, since apex nodes can be isolated, in contrast to the covector graphs from Definition 1. This leads to the notion of the dual STOM. If we are given a signed system (A, Σ) we can define its *dual* by $(A^\top, -\Sigma^\top)$. Notice that the dual of the dual is the primal again. This definition and a similar result was already stated in [18, Lemma 11].

Theorem 40. *A covector graph of a feasible point with maximal support S for (A, Σ) is a sufficiently infeasible covector graph, which negatively covers S , for its dual $(A^\top, -\Sigma^\top)$. A sufficiently infeasible covector graph, which negatively covers $[d] \setminus S$, is a feasible point with maximal support $[d] \setminus S$ for $(A^\top, -\Sigma^\top)$. In particular, the maximal supports of the feasible points of the dual systems are complementary to each other.*

Proof. The claim concerning the covector graphs follows from the symmetry in the structure of the covector graphs as bipartite graphs. The rest follows from Theorem 39 and Theorem 38. $\square$

8. MEAN PAYOFF GAMES

The connection between mean payoff games and tropical linear inequality system was established in [1]. With the generalization of the covector graphs from Section 7, we demonstrate the connection of our algorithm with strategies of mean payoff games.

We briefly introduce mean payoff games. Let $\mathcal{G} = (V_0 \sqcup V_1, E)$ be a finite bipartite directed graph with a weight function $\omega: A \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$ on the arcs.

We define a two-player game with full information on $\mathcal{G}$. The partition of the vertex set corresponds to the two players of the mean payoff game. Starting from one node, the players alternatingly choose an out-going arc of the current node and move to the head of the arc. As soon as the directed path, which is formed in this way, produces a cycle, the game finishes. The *value* is the sum of the weights on the arcs of the cycle.

A positional *strategy* for player $i \in \{0, 1\}$ is a subset τ_i of the edges, such that each vertex in V_i is incident to exactly one edge in τ_i .

Following [1, §3] and [24, §7.2.3], we say that a strategy is *winning* for player 0 if the value of the game is non-positive and winning for player 1 if the value is non-negative, independent of the choices of the adversary. Note that, by [14], such a mean payoff game has an optimal positional strategy.

We construct a signed system from the bipartite graph $\mathcal{G}$ with the weights ω similar to Section 3, but with switched signs.

Let $|V_0| = d$ and $|V_1| = n$. Then we define matrices $(a_{ji}) = A \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^{n \times d}$ and $(\sigma_{ji}) = \Sigma \in \{+, -, \bullet\}^{n \times d}$ by identifying each node in V_0 resp. V_1 with indices in $[d]$ resp. $[n]$ and setting

$$(4) \quad (a(v_1, v_0), \sigma(v_1, v_0)) = \begin{cases} (\omega(v_0, v_1), -) & (v_0, v_1) \in \mathcal{A} \\ (-\omega(v_1, v_0), +) & (v_1, v_0) \in \mathcal{A} \\ (\infty, \bullet) & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

for $v_0 \in V_0$ and $v_1 \in V_1$.




FIGURE 8. A bipartite graph $\mathcal{G}$ depicting a mean payoff game and a winning strategy τ for player 1.

Example 41. The signed system for the graph $\mathcal{G}$ from Figure 8 is given by

$$\begin{array}{cc} x_1 & x_2 \\ a_1 \left(\begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \end{array} \right) & a_1 \left(\begin{array}{cc} - & + \end{array} \right) \\ a_2 \left(\begin{array}{cc} 2 & 3 \end{array} \right) & a_2 \left(\begin{array}{cc} + & - \end{array} \right) \end{array} .$$

The corresponding inequality system is $x_1 \leq x_2 + 1$, $x_2 + 2 \leq x_1 + 3$. The winning strategy is obtained from the positive edges of the feasible point $(0, -1)$.

Let $x \in \mathbb{T}_{\min}^d$ be a feasible point of (A, Σ) of maximal support $S \subseteq [d]$ and G its covector graph. Let K be the set of apex nodes which are isolated in G . Then all the entries of the submatrix of A which is labeled by $S \times K$ are ∞ . Otherwise there would be an edge by the definition of the generalized covector G . Define τ as a subset of the positive edges of G such that each apex node in $[n] \setminus K$ is incident with exactly one edge in τ .

Let H be a sufficiently infeasible covector graph covering $([d] \setminus S)$. Define μ as a subset of the negative edges of H such that each coordinate node in $[d] \setminus S$ is incident with exactly one edge in μ .

Theorem 42. *τ is a winning strategy for player 1 and μ is a winning strategy for player 0.*

Proof. Because of the symmetry in the conditions on τ and μ it is enough to consider only player 1. At first, observe that the edges in τ correspond to out-going edges in $\mathcal{G}$ for the apex nodes in $[n] \setminus K$. With Prop. 3, we obtain that every matching in a covector graph is a minimal matching. If the game forms a cycle θ , then $\theta \cap \tau$ is a matching. To obtain the value of the cycle, we sum up the values alternatingly, where the arcs in $\theta \cap \tau$ have negated weights in $\mathcal{G}$ by (4). Since the matching is minimal, the value is non-positive. This holds for every cycle and implies the claim. $\square$

We finish with two questions concerning the algorithm in Section 5.

Question 43. What is the classical analogue of Algorithm 1 and its subroutine `FINDEXTREMECOVECTOR`?

Question 44. What is the maximal number of iterations of the while-loop starting in line 2 of Algorithm 3? This decides whether Algorithm 1 is polynomial.

Acknowledgments. I am grateful to Michael Joswig for his guidance and his inspiring questions. Also, I would like to thank Martin Skutella for his support and Henryk Michalewski for valuable discussions. Furthermore, many thanks to Robert Loewe and Benjamin Schröter for careful reading.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akian, M., Gaubert, S., Guterman, A.: Tropical polyhedra are equivalent to mean payoff games. *Internat. J. Algebra Comput.* 22(1), 1250001, 43 (2012), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S0218196711006674>
- [2] Allamigeon, X., Benchimol, P., Gaubert, S., Joswig, M.: Combinatorial simplex algorithms can solve mean payoff games. *SIAM J. Optim.* 24(4), 2096–2117 (2014)
- [3] Allamigeon, X., Benchimol, P., Gaubert, S., Joswig, M.: Tropicalizing the simplex algorithm. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* 29(2), 751–795 (2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/130936464>
- [4] Ardila, F., Billey, S.: Flag arrangements and triangulations of products of simplices. *Adv. Math.* 214(2), 495–524 (2007), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2007.02.014>
- [5] Ardila, F., Develin, M.: Tropical hyperplane arrangements and oriented matroids. *Math. Z.* 262(4), 795–816 (2009), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00209-008-0400-z>
- [6] Bland, R.G.: A combinatorial abstraction of linear programming. *J. Combinatorial Theory Ser. B* 23(1), 33–57 (1977)
- [7] Butkovic, P., Aminu, A.: Introduction to max-linear programming. *IMA J. Manag. Math.* 20(3), 233–249 (2009), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/imaman/dpn029>

- [8] Butkovič, P.: Max-linear systems: theory and algorithms. Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag London, Ltd., London (2010), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-84996-299-5>
- [9] Chubanov, S.: A polynomial projection algorithm for linear feasibility problems. *Math. Program.* 153(2, Ser. A), 687–713 (2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10107-014-0823-8>
- [10] Cuninghame-Green, R.: Minimax algebra, *Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems*, vol. 166. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York (1979)
- [11] Dantzig, G.B.: Linear programming and extensions. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. (1963)
- [12] De Loera, J.A., Rambau, J., Santos, F.: Triangulations, Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics, vol. 25. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2010), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-12971-1>, structures for algorithms and applications
- [13] Develin, M., Sturmfels, B.: Tropical convexity. *Doc. Math.* 9, 1–27 (electronic) (2004)
- [14] Ehrenfeucht, A., Mycielski, J.: Positional strategies for mean payoff games. *Internat. J. Game Theory* 8(2), 109–113 (1979), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01768705>
- [15] Fink, A., Rincón, F.: Stiefel tropical linear spaces. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 135, 291–331 (2015), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcta.2015.06.001>
- [16] Fukuda, K.: Oriented matroid programming. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI (1982), thesis (Ph.D.)—University of Waterloo (Canada)
- [17] Gel'fand, I.M., Goresky, R.M., MacPherson, R.D., Serganova, V.V.: Combinatorial geometries, convex polyhedra, and Schubert cells. *Adv. in Math.* 63(3), 301–316 (1987)
- [18] Grigoriev, D., Podolskii, V.V.: Tropical effective primary and dual Nullstellensätze. In: 32nd International Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science, LIPIcs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform., vol. 30, pp. 379–391. Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern (2015)
- [19] Hačijan, L.G.: A polynomial algorithm in linear programming. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* 244(5), 1093–1096 (1979)
- [20] Horn, S.: A topological representation theorem for tropical oriented matroids. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* 142, 77–112 (2016), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcta.2016.03.003>
- [21] Johnson, M., Kambites, M.: Face monoid actions and tropical hyperplane arrangements (2016), preprint arXiv:1604.03016
- [22] Joswig, M., Loho, G.: Weighted digraphs and tropical cones. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 501, 304–343 (2016), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2016.02.027>
- [23] Karmarkar, N.: A new polynomial-time algorithm for linear programming. *Combinatorica* 4(4), 373–395 (1984), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02579150>
- [24] Möhring, R.H., Skutella, M., Stork, F.: Scheduling with AND/OR precedence constraints. *SIAM J. Comput.* 33(2), 393–415 (2004), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/S009753970037727X>
- [25] Oh, S., Yoo, H.: Triangulations of $\Delta_{n-1} \times \Delta_{d-1}$ and tropical oriented matroids. In: 23rd International Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics (FPSAC 2011), pp. 717–728. *Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci. Proc.*, AO, Assoc. Discrete Math. Theor. Comput. Sci., Nancy (2011)
- [26] Richter-Gebert, J., Sturmfels, B., Theobald, T.: First steps in tropical geometry. In: *Idempotent mathematics and mathematical physics*, *Contemp. Math.*, vol. 377, pp. 289–317. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (2005), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/conm/377/06998>
- [27] Schrijver, A.: Combinatorial optimization. Polyhedra and efficiency. Vol. A, Algorithms and Combinatorics, vol. 24. Springer-Verlag, Berlin (2003), paths, flows, matchings, Chapters 1–38
- [28] Terlaky, T.: A finite criss-cross method for oriented matroids. *Alkalmaz. Mat. Lapok* 11(3-4), 385–398 (1985)
- [29] Todd, M.J.: Linear and quadratic programming in oriented matroids. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 39(2), 105–133 (1985), [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0095-8956\(85\)90042-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0095-8956(85)90042-5)
- [30] Zimmermann, K.: Conjugate optimization problems and algorithms in the extremal vector space. *Ekonom-Mat. Obzor* 10, 428–440 (1974)
- [31] Zwick, U., Paterson, M.: The complexity of mean payoff games on graphs. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 158(1-2), 343–359 (1996), [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975\(95\)00188-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0304-3975(95)00188-3)